

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, in view of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

The examiner rejects Claims 1, 4-5 and 6-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Sander et al. The examiner states that Claims 2 and 3 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim.

Accordingly, Claims 1 and 2 have been combined in order to produce an allowable claim. Claim 3 which was dependent upon Claim 2 has now been made dependent upon Claim 1. Claims 4-7 are now allowable as being dependent upon amended Claim 1.

The examiner rejects Claims 14-15, 30 and 33 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Gaessler et al. The examiner states that Claims 16-24 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Claims 14 and 16 have been combined to produce an allowable claim and Claim 16 has been cancelled. Claims 18 and 24 which is dependent upon Claim 16 have now been made dependent upon amended Claim 14.

The examiner rejects Claims 27-28 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Gaessler et al in view of Mangtani and further in view of Menegoli.

Claim 27 is dependent upon Claim 14. Claim 14 has been amended above in order to produce an allowable claim. Accordingly, Claim 27 is allowable for the same reasons. Claim 28 is dependent upon Claim 27 and is therefore patentable for the same reasons.

The examiner rejects Claim 31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Gaessler et al in view of Swize. The examiner rejects Claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatenable over Gaessler et al in view of Ribarich et al.

Claim 31 and 32 are dependent upon Claim 14, which has been amended above in order to produce an allowable claim. Accordingly, these claims are allowable for the same reasons.

The examiner has objected to Claims 34-36 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. These claims are dependent directly or indirectly from Claim 14, which has been amended above to produce an allowable claim. Accordingly, these claims are patentable for the same reasons.

The examiner has allowed Claims 8-13.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted by,
Texas Instruments Incorporated

/William B Kempler/
William B. Kempler
Senior Corporate Patent Counsel
Reg. No. 28,228
Tel.: (972) 917-5452

This document was created with Win2PDF available at <http://www.daneprairie.com>.
The unregistered version of Win2PDF is for evaluation or non-commercial use only.